REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office action dated September 30, 2003, applicants have amended the application as set forth above. Claims 3, 4, 9, 10 and 11 remain in this application. Applicants request reconsideration based on the amendments set forth above in view of the following comments.

Objections to the Claims and Abstract

In response to the examiner's objections, applicants have amended the abstract as suggested by the examiner, and have amended the claims to eliminate the use of parenthesis. A substitute abstract is attached. Consequently, these objections are now moot.

Section 112 Rejections

Applicant has canceled claims 1 and 2 making any rejection to those claims under Section 112 moot.

In response to the examiner's assertions that the specification fails to enable compounds having an -O-O- bond, and that the claims fail to find support for compounds having an -O-O- bond, applicants disagree. However, in the hopes of securing allowance of the claims, applicants have amended the specification and claims to state that for R_2, R_4, R_{14} and R_{16}, "if both R and R' are O, then β is not 0."

Double Patenting Rejection

With this response, applicants are submitting a Terminal Disclaimer as to U.S. Application Serial No. 10/076,317, which will issue as U.S. Patent No. 6,699,951 on March 2, 2004, making this basis for rejection moot.

Claim Rejections Under Section 102

Applicants have canceled claims 1, 2, and 5 to 8 making the rejection of these claims moot.

For claims 3, 4, and 9 to 11, the examiner has rejected these claims as anticipated by Jung et al. According to the examiner, Jung et al. disclose a polymer made up of monomer units of the form "a" and "d" as set forth in the specification and claims 3-4 and 9-10. However, in rejecting these claims it appears that the examiner may have not fully considered the definitions for a, b, c, and d in setting forth the ratios of individual monomers in the given formulae of claims 3 and 9. According to these claims: "a has a value of 0 - 0.5, b has a value of 0 - 0.9, c has a value of 0 - 0.3, and d has a value of 0 - 0.3, provided that a + b + c + d = 1." According to these limitations, specific combinations of monomers are required. For example, while the polymer may include only two monomers, for such a polymer, one must be the "b" monomer with the balance being any one of the remaining three monomers. While Jung et al. may teach a combination of the "a" and "d" monomers they fail to teach or suggest a polymer including monomer units of both "d" and "b." For all other combinations of the claimed invention, there must be at least three of the four monomers, therefore, to the extent Jung et al. may teach or suggest a polymer including the "a" and "d" monomers, they fail to teach the inclusion of either of the "b" or "c" monomers along with the "a" and "d" monomers. Because the specific combinations claimed are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art, claims 3, 4 and 9-11 are allowable.

Conclusion

Claims 3, 4, and 9 to 11 remain in this application. Applicants submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance. However, if there are any remaining issues which can best be addressed by telephone, the examiner is asked to contact applicants' attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By _David A. Plumley_

David A. Plumley
Reg. No. 37,208
626/795-9900

DAP/cls
Enclosure: Substitute Abstract